REMARKS

In the most recent office action, the Examiner cited seven non-patent publications that each discuss a project undertaken by a consortium in 1997 to establish a standard for "Digital Object Identifiers" (DOI). Under this standard, works of authorship, referred to as "creations", would each be given a unique identifier which could be entered into a database accessible via the global computer network. The database could be accessed by anyone to learn information about the work of authorship, including information that identifies the publisher or other owner of copyrights and possibly including a link that the user might click on to go to a website maintained by the owner of the copyrights to learn licensing information and perhaps obtain a license via an online transaction.

There are two important distinctions (points of novelty) that distinguish the invention specified in the pending independent claims, 84, 95, and 108, from the DOI system as disclosed by the cited publications.

First, the cited publications do not suggest that there might be a unique web page for each document, thereby establishing a one-to-one correspondence between documents and licensing web pages. Prior to the inventions described in the present patent application, information made available by publishers about availability of licenses to make uses of works of authorship published by that publisher typically included references to many works of authorship on each licensing web page. That is, the licensing web page stated terms for licensing any of a long list of works which were each listed on that page. An important invention of the present patent application that is specified by claims 84, 95, and 108 is that there is a separate licensing web page served by a server for each licensable work of authorship.

In the prior art systems, a user found access to the licensing web page by identifying the publisher or other copyright owner. Once the page was reached, it was natural for that one page to describe the licensing terms for many works of authorship, any of which was available on the same terms. By contrast, the inventors of the presently claimed system envisioned that users will come to a licensing web page through an identification of the work of authorship rather than an identification of the publisher. The inventors conceived that it would be better for the user to be presented terms for licensing only that one work of authorship and not others. The inventors therefore conceived that there should be a one-to-one relationship between works of authorship and licensing web pages. This is specified in claims 84, 95, and 108 with the language: "each

licensing web page associated with *one* of a *plurality* of viewable works of authorship". Nothing in any of the cited articles about DOI suggest that there might be a unique licensing web page for each work of authorship rather than one web page providing information from many works of authorship as was previously known.

A second point of novelty distinguishes the three independent claims from the DOI prior art. In the DOI system, clicking on a DOI icon would lead the user to a directory server maintained by a nonprofit organization. The directory server would have information about all works, throughout the world, that have been registered with the nonprofit organization. However, as stated in the October 1997 article referred to as "reference D", the author stated in the fourth paragraph "Nor would it handle financial transactions but it would work with other systems on the Internet which handle such matters." As stated on page two of the April 21, 1997 article referred to as "reference B" in the paragraph hand marked "3": "Clicking on the button sends users across the Internet to the automated 'directory' *and then to* the current publisher/owner's computer system." None of the articles suggest that clicking on the button in the document will lead the user directly to a licensing web page.

The inventors of the present system as claimed by independent claims 84, 95, and 108 conceived that the button in the document should not merely link to a web page having information about the document, such as identification of the publisher, from which a user could then navigate further to a licensing web site, but should, right then and there, present the information for engaging in a licensing transaction. This aspect of the invention is specified in claims 84, 95, and 108 with the language: "a hot spot which, when selected at the client computer, uses the unique work identifier associated with said work *to direct the client computer to* a licensing web page for the associated work of authorship". This specifies that there is no intermediate stop, no intermediate page with information which offers an opportunity to click through to the publisher's licensing web page.

Thus, the applicant has pointed out two separate points of novelty over the cited prior art in each of the three independent claims. Each of these points of novelty is a significant advance over the prior art and each by itself is a sufficient basis for allowing the independent claims.

Because the independent claims are allowable, the dependent claims are also allowable. However, three of the dependent claims deserve particular mention. Claims 91, 99, and 112

specify a feature that is not suggested in any of the prior art. These claims specify that the licensing web page "includes a field in which a portion of the article to be used can be specified." By dependence, the claim specifies that there is a licensing web page for a work of authorship which is a text article. In other words, the claim specifies that the unique work identifier refers to the entire article and the user can specify a smaller portion of the article for licensed use by the user.

It is true that, in the DOI system, any work of authorship that consists of more than a single paragraph can be broken into parts, each of which has a distinct DOI to identify the part. The user can then obtain information about the part by itself and can use information about that part to lead to a licensing transaction for the part. However, there is nothing that suggests that the user might propose to license less than the entire part, which is specified by claims 91, 99, and 112.

If the Examiner has any questions regarding this matter, Applicant requests the Examiner contact the undersigned at the number listed below

Respectfully submitted,
GRAYBEAL JACKSON HALEY LLP

Jeffrey T. Haley
Registration No. 34,834
155 108th Avenue NE, Suite 350
Bellevue, Washington 98004-5901
Telephone: (425) 455-5575
Fax: (425) 455-1046